

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Sepia Vonnetta Blackstock,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:18-cv-00056-RBH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Patricia Ann Miller,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Amended Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.). *See* ECF No. 17. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s pro se complaint without prejudice, and that the Court consider entry of sanctions if she files one more frivolous civil action. *Id.* at p. 7.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983).

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s objections were due by February 15, 2018. *See* ECF Nos. 17 & 18.

The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge’s Amended R & R [ECF No. 17]. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s complaint *without prejudice and without issuance and service of process*.

The Court hereby **NOTIFIES** Plaintiff that if her troublesome actions continue, it will consider the entry of sanctions against her as a result of her exhibited tendency to file frivolous suits and to create excessive waste of judicial resources. If Plaintiff files one more frivolous action, the Court will enter sanctions against her, such as denying her the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis* and requiring her to pay the full filing fee in future cases.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
February 21, 2018

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge